

For example, Koivu and Verrier, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest a method of assigning radio channels to a set of base stations in a wireless network, comprising: “determining a set of radio channels to include all radio channels which said set of base stations have at their disposal for communication, and assigning one radio channel out of said determined set of radio channels to each base station during manufacture of the base stations in such a way that each radio channel in said determined set of radio channels is assigned substantially an equal number of times”, as recited in claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Koivu merely discloses a communication network including base stations that are in communication with a base station controller. (*See* FIG. 1). Koivu teaches that a common channel is used in the various communication branches that connect the base stations to the base station controller. (*See* col. 3, lines 13-23). However, and as agreed upon during the Interview, Koivu does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claim 1 for at least the following reasons.

First, Koivu is silent as to determining a set of radio channels and then assigning one radio channel out of the determined set to each base station during manufacture of the base stations in such a way that each radio channel in the determined set of radio channels is assigned substantially an equal number of times.

Second, Koivu teaches away from the features of claim 1 because Koivu teaches that the base stations have at their disposal additional channels that are different from those assigned during manufacturing. Specifically, Koivu teaches that each base station adjusts its transmission unit to use a base station specific channel as a response to a branching table transmitted to the base station on the common channel. (*See* col. 3, lines 35-60). Therefore, in Koivu, base stations have at their disposal additional base station specific channels that are not assigned as the common channels during manufacturing of the base station.

As mentioned in Applicant’s previous Amendment, Verrier fails to remedy the deficiencies of Koivu. Verrier merely discloses a method of dynamically allocating channels in a cellular radio network to form logical channels dedicated to communications in circuit mode between mobile stations and geographically distributed base stations.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Koivu and claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Koivu in view of Verrier are respectfully requested.

CARPELAN -- 09/851,436
Client/Matter: 060258-0280347

The rejection having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



CHRISTINE H. MCCARTHY

Reg. No. 41844

Tel. No. 703.770.7743

Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: November 28, 2005

CHM/CFL
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900